

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

In the claims

Independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 14 are amended to more clearly define the first transmission channel and the second transmission channel between the data carrier and an external device.

For example, claim 1 is amended to more positively set forth the first and second transmission channels, by reciting a step of establishing a first bidirectional transmission channel between the data carrier and the external device and a step of establishing a second bidirectional transmission channel between the data carrier and the external device.

Support for the amendment is found in the original claims, as well as pages 4-5, and figure 1, of the original application.

Rejection of claims 1, 8-10, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 8-10, 12, and 14 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by Saliba (U.S. 5,894,425). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 8, 12, and 14 are amended to more clearly define separate first and second transmission channels between the data carrier and an external device. For example, claims 1 and 8 each describe a method wherein first and second bidirectional transmission channels are established between the data carrier and the external device.

The Examiner has indicated that the phrase in the first clause of claim 1 “for transmitting signals [...]” merely states an intended use or purpose for the claimed step of “providing a first bidirectional transmission.” In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims positively indicate that the data carrier and the external device are connected for communications by both the first and the second transmission channels.

That is, according to the present invention, two bidirectional channels are established between the data carrier and an external device. Signals are transferred via the first data channel for the purpose of exchanging data between the data carrier and the external device, and authenticity signals are transferred between the data carrier and the external device. The first and second data channels are logically, or physically, separate from one another.

It is respectfully submitted that Saliba fails to disclose or suggest that Saliba fails to disclose or suggest a data carrier and an external device wherein *first and second* bidirectional transmission channels are established between the data carrier and the external device.

On the contrary, Saliba discloses a field unit 50, having a data communication channel for communicating between the field unit and a drive unit. The data communication channel is disclosed as an infrared (IR) interface. (see *Saliba*; col. 5, lines 26-43; col. 6, lines 17-36). Separately, the field unit optionally includes a wireless radio send/receive unit, such as for cellular wireless communication, for communicating with a remote host computer. (see *Saliba*; col. 5, lines 44-46).

Thus, Saliba discloses a field unit that communicates via a first communication channel with a first external device, and via a second communication channel with a second, different external device. Therefore, although Saliba discloses multiple communication channels, Saliba does not disclose or suggest two logically or physically separate data transfer channels between the field unit and the drives, or, alternatively, between the field unit and the host computer. That is, Saliba does not disclose or suggest *two devices* which communicate *with one another* via two bidirectional communication channels.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Saliba fails to disclose each and every element set forth in the independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 14, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 8, 12, and 14, as well as their respective dependent claims 2-7, 9-

11, and 13, are allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-7, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 11, and 13 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Saliba in view of Ehrat (U.S. 3,806,874). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As discussed above, Saliba does not disclose or suggest two logically or physically separate data transfer channels between the field unit and the drives, or, alternatively, between the field unit and the host computer. That is, Saliba does not disclose or suggest *two devices* which communicate *with one another* via two bidirectional communication channels.

It is respectfully submitted that Ehrat also fails to disclose or suggest *two bidirectional data channels* between a first and a second device. Ehrat discloses a single duplex transmission channel. According to the duplex scheme for communicating, first and second devices each have a transmitter and a receiver, whereby a single bi-directional communication channel is established.

As Ehrat states, "duplex transmission may operate with two different transmission frequencies so that transmission may take place simultaneously in both directions." (Ehrat; col. 6, lines 33-35). However, this does not describe two bidirectional communication channels. Instead, the duplex scheme described by Ehrat comprises only two mono-directional channels which together make up only *a single bidirectional* channel.

Ehrat fails to disclose or suggest the two bidirectional channels of the presently claimed invention, and therefore Ehrat fails to supplement the deficiencies of Saliba. Saliba and Ehrat together fail to disclose or suggest two bidirectional data channels provided between the data carrier and a (single) external device, and therefore Saliba and Ehrat together fail to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claims 1-7, 11, and 13. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 11, and 13 are

allowable over the cited references, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-14 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: April 20, 2009

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Schaefer", written in a cursive style.

JOHN R. SCHAEFER  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,921